

**TELEFAX**REMARKS***Regarding Claim Rejection -35 U.S.C. § 103***

1. In response to the Office Action dated 03/07/2005, the following is respectfully submitted.

2. Regarding claims 1 and 21 the following remarks are submitted in respect to non-obviousness according to 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a):

The Examiner rejected said claims as being unpatentable over Maggenti et al. (US 6,477,150 B1) hereinafter Maggenti and in view of Rai et al. (US 6,577,643 B1) hereinafter Rai. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection on the basis of the following amendments and remarks.

Independent claim 1 is now directed to a method of updating radio network data in a radio telecommunications network. A Base Station (BS) is located in the radio telecommunications network and comprises a plurality of devices. The BS is interfaced with a Mobile Switching Center (MSC) through an Internet Protocol (IP) packet data network. The BS is further assigned an IP address valid on the IP packet data network. The MSC sends device update data to the BS in an IP message over the IP packet data network using the IP address. It is now clarified that the transmission of the IP message from the MSC to the BS is performed by means of the IP address. Subsequently, the BS receives the IP message over the IP packet data network. Finally, at least one of the plurality of devices is updated by the BS using the device update data received in the IP message wherein the at least one of the plurality of devices is identified by means of the IP message. It has been emphasized that the addressing of the plurality of devices within the BS is performed by means of the IP message.

Maggenti describes a solution for providing a group communication between end users in a communication system. The group communication is realized by means of a communications manager (Maggenti: col. 3 lines 58-65), wherein a wireless end user sends

Page 8 of 13

09/727,189

8400 Decarie Boul.
Montreal, QC H4P 2N2 CANADA

Tel: 1-514-345-7891
Fax: 1-514-345-7929



TELEFAX

a request going via a BS and MSC to the communication manager, which administrates a granting of the transmission privilege to one user for transmitting data to a group of users (Maggenti: col. 6 lines 62- col. 7 line 7). Further Maggenti discloses a method for updating users records in the communications manager (Maggenti: col. 17 lines 14-45), wherein the input is provided by the users (Maggenti: col. 12 lines 16 -17). Also a net database is disclosed for administrating the groups of users based on users registrations (Maggenti: col.17 line 46- col.18 line 48). Further an interface between the communication manager and a network administrator is proposed for the purpose of reporting about the users and the users groups (Maggenti: col. 18 line 49 – col. 19 line 21).

Maggenti does not disclose a method of updating radio network data in a base station BS, only an update of the users data in a database located in the system is disclosed. Although Maggenti discloses a BS being located in a radio telecommunications network and a Mobile Switching Center (MSC), no interfacing between the BS and MSC through an Internet Protocol (IP) packet data network is disclosed. Fig. 2 shows that the IP network (Fig. 2, 214) is applied for transport of data between different networks (in Fig. 2 it is depicted by the users 202, 204, 206 and 210 and 208 being connected to different networks). However Maggenti does not disclose any utilization of the IP network between BSs and MSC (216 and 220). Consequently an assigning the BS an IP address valid on the IP packet data network is not disclosed. Rai discloses to assign IP addresses to the end users in order to issues a communication between the users. The assignment of the IP addresses for the users for the purpose of updating the user's devices is even not suggested. Despite of this, the fact is that Maggenti never suggests assigning an IP address to the BS. Further both sending of device update data from the MSC to the BS in an IP message over the IP packet data network using the IP address and receiving of the IP message at the BS are also not disclosed. Also the updating at of least one of the plurality of devices by the BS using the device update data from the IP message wherein the at least one of the plurality of devices is identified by the IP address is not disclosed. Further, the present inventions in the amended claim 1 clarifies that the knowledge, which of the at least one of the plurality of devices is to be updated, is delivered from the IP message. This feature is also not disclosed in Rai.



TELEFAX

Rai describes a solution to provide end users, in particular wireless end users, with remote access to the Internet. For this aim Rai proposes to establish between a base station BS serving the end user and a corresponding MSC a PPP tunnel for transporting data packets for one user (Rai: col.9 lines 17-38). Herein it is stated that such a tunnel is created for every single user (Rai: col. 7 line 57). If an end user moves from one base station to another, a new tunnel is to be created to the MSC (Rai: col.8 lines 32-40). In order to guarantee the internet service while roaming, an IP network is utilized between a MSC in a foreign network and the MSC in the home network, wherein the users data is relayed through the foreign network to the home MSC (Rai: col 8 lines 48 - 61).

As can be appreciated, Rai relates to a radio telecommunications network, as the present invention, and mentions the use of a BS and an MSC. However, Rai does not mention the BS having a plurality of devices therewithin. Further Rai even does not provide a solution for handling a number of users, since it concentrates on higher protocol layers handling an end-to-end transport of user data between one end user and the Internet. For the end-to-end connection a tunnel is utilized between the BS and the MSC and IP network is only used between the MSC and the Internet-access point for routing the user's data. The applied tunneling protocol has to guarantee in-sequence transport of data packets with flow control (Rai: col. 7 lines 57-62). That means that on this tunnel only one user might be handled and never data for a number of users might be transported thereover.

Further, Rai discloses that the transport over the tunnel might be based on IP-network or on a point-to-point network or ATM network or frame relay data network. The utilization of the IP protocol below the tunnel is only for the transport of the tunneled data, however there is no IP-addressing, because in a tunneling technique an own way of addressing is used, and therefore for example no routing mechanism using IP addresses is applied. Obviously in Rai a relation between a user and the tunnel is to be ensured, independent on the transport protocol underneath, in order to forward the user's data on/from the right tunnel. The forwarding of data in BS takes place because the data coming on the tunnel is never addressed to the BS. Therefore Rai does not disclose to assign an IP address to the BS valid on the IP packet data network and to send any data from the MSC to the BS in an IP message over the IP packet data network using the IP address assigned to the BS, since the data are tunneled and a tunneling addressing is applied valid for the tunnels on the connection between BS and MSC



TELEFAX

and not valid on the IP packet data network. Consequently Rai does not disclose updating of at least one of the plurality of devices within the BS using the device update data from the IP message, because a plurality of devices within one BS is not described. Further, the present inventions in the amended claim 1 clarifies that the knowledge, which of the at least one of the plurality of devices is to be updated, is delivered from the IP message. This feature is also not disclosed in Rai.

Summarizing, neither Maggenti nor Rai discloses utilization of IP network using IP address between BS and MS. Further, none of the documents discloses a BS with a plurality of devices, which are updated by means of an update message being distributed to said devices by means of an IP address. The combination of Maggenti and Rosi, in view of the object for providing a solution for updating radio network data that reduce the number of messages required, might lead to having a BS, as mentioned by the examiner with a number of receiver/transceiver for handling user located in the serving area of the BS. Further a number of tunnels, one tunnel for each user, from the BS to the MSC would be established, and subsequently an IP network would be used for the routing the user's data from the MSC towards to other networks. The examiner alleges that the mechanisms of a handover procedure would lead to the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that the handover procedure concerns always only one user. A user initiating an update procedure sends an update request to the MSC. In response the MSC updates the user's entries in the BS, whereupon the receiver/transmitter for the particular user is released. However the updates according to the handover even in combination with Maggenti never leads to any updates for a number of users in a BS, because a handover procedure concentrates always on one user being appointed to inform about the direction of the movement. Since there is no possibility to release a plurality of devices with only one IP message, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Maggenti and Rosi can not lead to the feature of claim1, in which a plurality of devices are updated with one message. Further, since either of the documents does not disclose an IP network between BS and MSC utilizing IP addresses for addressing BS, it is not obvious at all to come the present invention. Even if it is mentioned to assign IP addresses to the users for communication purpose, it requires still some steps to come to the solution of assigning IP addresses to BS, all above, because it is for updating purpose.

**TELEFAX**

The Applicant respectfully submits according to the foregoing comments that claim 1 fulfils the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a). Further it is respectfully submitted that the some remarks applies to claim 14 and 21, since the same amendments as in claim 1 have been carried out.

Regarding the remaining claims:

These are dependent claims, which are based on the patentability of claims 1 and 21. Since the Applicant respectfully submits according to the foregoing comments that claims 1 and 21 are allowable, it is also respectfully requested to allow these claims over the art of record.

**TELEFAX**CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the present patent application is now in condition for favorable action.

Should the Examiner wish to further discuss the present response or patent application, the undersigned can be reached at (514) 345-7891.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "S Beauchesne".

Sandra Beauchesne
Reg. No.43,422